

## **Historic, Archive Document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



A275.24  
F76

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
LIBRARY

FOR ADMINISTRATIVE USE



BOOK NUMBER A275.24  
817182 F76

FOR ADMINISTRATIVE USE ONLY

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GERMAN AGRICULTURAL  
AND HOME ECONOMICS EVALUATION  
AND INFORMATION SERVICE

BY  
Andrew J. Nichols



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
Foreign Agricultural Service  
and  
FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION  
Office of Agriculture and Natural Resources  
November 1953



847182

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
The Background	1
The Over-all Plan for Agricultural Research, Education, and Extension	4
A German Federal Agricultural Research and Extension Service	5
The Course of Events	6
Garnett's Proposal to Higher Headquarters	7
Action on the Proposal	10
Implementation of the Paris Decision	11
Littmann, the First Director of AID	14
An Organizational Decision	14
The New Project Gets Underway	15
The Financial Situation Improves	18
Repercussions from the States	19
Littmann Visits the United States	19
Growing Pains of the New Organization	20
Progress of the New Undertaking	21
New Leadership and Continued ECA Financial Support	23
Petrich Visits the United States	25
AID Becomes a "Registered Association"	26
Internal Organization and Progress of AID, December 31, 1951	27
Developments During 1952	29
Accomplishments by the Fall of 1952	32
Retrospect	34
Appendix A - Explanation of Counterpart Funds	38
Appendix B - Developments in 1952-53 (October 1952 - October 1953)	39







# THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GERMAN AGRICULTURAL AND HOME ECONOMICS EVALUATION AND INFORMATION SERVICE

## Introduction

This is a progress report of the genesis and development of the German Agricultural and Home Economics Evaluation and Information Service (AID). It is an account of a technical and economic assistance program, and the various problems and issues that were encountered in its implementation. It is a story of the ECA (Economic Cooperation Administration) Food and Agricultural Mission in West Germany, and the working together of members of the Mission and German agricultural officials in establishing a federal agricultural information service. The program is now far enough advanced to provide the student of technical assistance work with a pattern of development for study and reflection.

The story deserves telling because it involves many questions common to technical and economic assistance work: (1) What is the proper role of a foreign technician in a technical and economic assistance situation? (2) How does an administrator of a technical assistance program combat the tendencies of his staff "to go native," thereby losing proper perspective of their assignments? (3) Should the foreign technician strive to sell organizational arrangements and ideas with the same vigor that he uses in matters of philosophy principles, and techniques? (4) Can the foreign technician hope to secure a complete acceptance of what he brings from the outside, or must he be prepared to realize that there is never a complete acceptance, that a reworking and reinterpretation is inevitable in crosscultural situations? (5) How does the foreign technician and administrator assist in establishing a new administrative organization within a complex social system, gearing it in with public and private institutions so as to gain acceptance and support of vested interests? (6) Can one person serve effectively as both administrator and advisor in a technical and economic assistance situation? Answers, or partial answers, to these questions appear in the account that follows.

## The Background

West Germany's dependence on United States dollar aid for food and fodder imports during the first ECA year, ending June 30, 1949, had amounted to approximately 1 billion dollars, and other large amounts had been received in earlier years of the allied occupation. Consequently, one of the primary objectives of the ECA program in Germany was to promote food imports through trade, in order to reduce that country's dependence on dollar aid. A second objective was to reduce West Germany's need for food imports by increasing agricultural production at home. Our story deals with one of the efforts that was directed toward reaching the second objective.

By August 1949, with a new German government in prospect, the thinking of the ECA Food and Agricultural Mission in West Germany had crystallized, and a course of action had been decided on for increasing the productivity of German agriculture. The Mission had concluded that any fundamental program for actually changing and improving German agriculture must stress the following approaches: (1) Agricultural research, education, and extension; (2) incentive income; (3) land consolidation and improvements; and (4) farm management and farm requisites. 1/

Our concern here is with the "agricultural research, education, and extension" component - more specifically, with extension. For a better understanding of this emphasis on extension and as a background for the story to follow, it is well to survey briefly the German advisory service for farmers as it existed in the early postwar years. Germany has had an advisory service for a hundred years or more.

In the northern states of West Germany the function of the advisory service was performed by two important rural institutions, the Chambers of Agriculture and the Agricultural, or Winter, Schools. In the southern states the arrangement was different owing to the absence of Chambers of Agriculture, and there the state ministries of agriculture joined with the Winter Schools in performing advisory functions. 2/ In addition to these two general arrangements, "advisory rings" existed in parts of the northern states. These rings were made up of farmers (usually about 50 to a ring) who cooperatively employed agricultural specialists to advise them. It was customary for the states to pay part of the expense of maintaining the rings. Thus it can be seen that there was no uniform advisory system for all of West Germany.

The Chambers of Agriculture, which dated back to the time of Bismarck, were quasi-government in character and were supported by taxes on agricultural lands and by grants from the federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Forestry. They were primarily educational, but at times engaged in regulatory work for the government. In addition, some of them purchase farm supplies for their members. The governing body of each Chamber was elected by farmers and farm workers; and this board appointed, with the approval of the state minister of agriculture, an executive officer to manage the Chamber. Although the Chambers had considerable autonomy, the fact that they were largely dependent on government funds gave the ministries of agriculture considerable control and direction over their operations.

Each Chamber consisted of several sections specifically devoted to such matters as advisory work, the Agricultural Schools, agronomy, animal husbandry, horticulture, and plant protection, depending on the needs of the farmers in an area. In some instances the work of the Agricultural Schools and the advisory service was combined under one person in the Chamber. In any event, the work in each section was conducted by a central staff and a field organization.

---

1/ Food, Agriculture, and Forestry Group, Bipartite Control Office (BICO), "Report to Dr. Dennis A. Fitzgerald on Prospects and Problems of Food, Agriculture, and Forestry in Western Germany," August 1949.

2/ The following states have Chambers of Agriculture: Schleswig-Holstein, Niedersachsen, Nordrhein-Westfalen, Hessen, Rheinland-Pfalz, Baden-Wuerttemberg, Bremen. Bayern and Hamburg have no Chambers of Agriculture.



The Agricultural Schools, of which there were 500 in West Germany, were local kries (county) institutions. The course of study covered 2 years, with a term of 5 months each year, from November through March. For girls the term was somewhat longer. During the 7 months when school was not in session the teaching staff was engaged in advisory work, especially in farm-practice work with the students. The schools were strongly supported by the rural people and in many ways were considered the agricultural centers of the counties. The director of each school was administratively responsible to the director of the Agricultural School section of the Chamber, or, in states where there were no Chambers, to the minister of agriculture. The director of an Agricultural School was usually the director of advisory work in the county and, as such, was responsible to the director of advisory service in the Chamber.

In general, the relation between extension and teaching in the Agricultural Schools was fairly close because both were administratively under the same person, the director of the school. On the other hand, there was little or no administrative relation between the research institutions and the advisory service. Likewise, there was little official relationship between the advisory service and the colleges. The research stations tended to work more or less independently of one another. Also, there was a lack of systematic procedures for pointing out farmers' problems to the research institutions and scientific findings to the farmers.

According to estimates, West Germany's advisory service reached about one-third of the farmers. It emphasized the solving of production problems and spent most of its efforts on farmers with five hectares or more. Its main teaching method was the individual farm visit; only limited use was made of bulletins, newspapers, and radio. 3/

Members of the ECA Food and Agricultural Mission, like their predecessors in Military Government, tended to be critical of the German advisory service and had several reservations about the way in which it was organized and conducted. The following quotation well summarizes the principal criticisms:

"Not only had German agricultural research been retarded in the past, but its findings had never filtered down to the average farmer with sufficient speed or on an adequate scale. Observers in the later Military Government period felt that some of the Laender (states) were making commendable post-war efforts to establish an extension service but that "the art of disseminating knowledge to farmers" was undeveloped.

"A report written by an observer in October 1949, after five months of investigation, made the following statement:

'A study of teaching and research seems to indicate that methods employed here in Germany are due to a desire to have exclusive use of facts and information and that publication in book, bulletin, or circular makes more common the knowledge of facts and weakens the position of the teacher or research worker.'

---

3/ Agricultural Advisory Service in European Countries, report of a working party of experts, Organization for European Economic Cooperation, Paris, 1950, pp. 95-99.

"The author went on to comment regarding the agricultural extension system, by which the teachers employed in the agricultural "winter schools" became agricultural advisors during the remainder of the year. He felt that they were behind the times and that their influence was not wide enough, despite the fact that they had done commendable work in the field demonstrations and tests. In general, he believed that there should be more full-time extension workers, but that their work should be coordinated with that of the schools. Such non-teaching extension workers as were already employed were specialists who were not enough concerned with farm management and the over-all picture. These men, as well as the winter school teachers during the half year when they were doing extension work, generally gave too much attention to individual farmers. To the American observer, it was obvious that German extension workers were untrained in modern methods of mass education. Furthermore, facilities were lacking for bringing them up-to-date as to agricultural knowledge by refresher courses. A common problem to agricultural education and extension was the lack of facilities and sometimes of office and classroom space at the more than 500 winter and special agricultural schools. Finally, because of limited budgets, the extension service was badly handicapped as to transportation, something of real importance since the advisor must take his knowledge to the farmer. A sweeping criticism of the advisory system in West Germany was that it was "large and expensive . . . in relation to the results achieved". 4/

In the United States Zone a considerable effort was made during 1948 and 1949 to introduce various American extension ideas on organization, methods, and techniques. American extension consultants were brought to Germany, and German advisory personnel traveled to the United States. The program was financed from counterpart funds allocated for "reorientation" purposes. 5/ In addition to the general effort to improve the German advisory system, demonstrational counties were established in three states and extension was organized in large measure along the United States pattern, with a farmers' committee in each county to develop programs and with full-time agricultural advisors. This early work was to provide a foundation for the wider extension programs initiated and financed by ECA counterpart grants-in-aid.

#### The Over-All Plan for Agricultural Research, Education and Extension

By August of 1949, Gwynn Garnett, Chief of the ECA Agricultural Mission in Germany, and his colleagues had concluded that a more vigorous, comprehensive, and systematic effort on the agricultural research, education, and extension

4/ Food and Agricultural Programs in West Germany. Office of the U. S. High Commissioner for Germany. 1952, P-161.

5/ See Appendix A for explanation of counterpart funds.



front would pay big dividends to German agriculture. They felt that the Mission had a threefold task: (1) To encourage and assist German scientific research in obtaining from other countries the new discoveries in agriculture; (2) to strengthen and assist German research institutions in adapting the new knowledge; (3) to assist in expanding and modernizing the agricultural extension service in order to bring the results of research down to the individual farmer in a usable form. 6/ With the prospect of early availability of ECA counterpart funds, the time seemed auspicious to move ahead.

Gwynn Garnett and his chief agricultural production men, Samuel Williams and Norman Smith, proceeded to work out, with their German coworkers a comprehensive program for agricultural research, education, and extension. The original plan called for a yearly expenditure for three years of 50 million DM (deutschemarks), but the request was later lowered to 35 million DM. The plan entailed financial aid for home economics institutes, agricultural schools and classes for girls, agricultural research, technical assistance, equipment for agricultural extension workers, promotion of young agricultural scientists, equipment for state and federal research stations, and other projects. 7/

#### A German Federal Agricultural Research and Extension Service

One part of Garnett's overall plan provided for establishment of a federal agricultural research and extension service. It seemed to him that progress was being made at the county and state levels in improving the German advisory system, but that there was an urgent need to do something at the federal level. Only two small offices, one for home economics and one for agricultural extension, existed in the federal Ministry for Food, Agriculture, and Forestry. Both offices were located in the Department for Production and were restricted in size and function. In fact, only one professional person was assigned to each office. The task of these offices was to encourage the development of advisory work at the county and state levels.

In February 1950 Garnett submitted to his superiors his plans for a federal agricultural research and extension service, and described the situation, need, and purposes in these words:

"The U. S. occupation authorities early recognized the great need for intensifying agricultural research and extension services for German farmers. In each of the Laender of the U. S. Zone, approximately 30,000 DM per month were made available for starting extension work about a year ago. With these funds very satisfactory progress has been made in introducing Land (State) extension services and subordinate extension services in demonstrating counties, by better organization, by providing better trained advisors and educational materials. The Ministries of these Laender have now taken a real interest in

---

6/ Food and Agricultural Programs in West Germany, OP, P-163.

7/ Ibid. Pp. 163-164. One Deutsche Mark is approximately equal to twenty-three cents.

the work and it is felt that extension services will spread to other counties in the U. S. Zone (with German appropriated funds.) Financial support for this project originated from reorientation funds and were applicable only to the U. S. Zone.

"To fully achieve the objectives of both the High Commission and ECA in expanding and intensifying research and extension activities, it is believed desirable to extend experimental areas into the Laender of the British and French Zones similar to those already established in the Laender of the U. S. Zone of Occupation and furthermore, to provide a modest beginning for a Federal research and extension service. Since the war it has not yet been possible to re-establish on a Federal level an agricultural research and information service which could adequately and efficiently serve all Laender. There is a pressing need for coordinating the results of recent German agricultural research, integrating these results with those of foreign countries and disseminating the final results through bulletins, leaflets, periodicals, the press, radio and film throughout the farm population.

"It is proposed that a Federal agricultural research and extension service be established for the following purposes:

- "(1) For gathering, interpolating and evaluating German and foreign results of agricultural research and the preparation of publications, films, radio and press services for all German advisory and extension workers.
- "(2) For coordinating and conducting special training schools and short-courses in subject matter pertinent to the increase of German food production and in extension methods.
- "(3) For administering funds and coordinating research and extension on immediately pressing German agricultural problems with special attention being directed toward research in farm management on small farms, farmer opinion and attitudes as a basis for effectively adapting extension work to the needs of individual farmers.
- "(4) For providing a nucleus of a research and extension service which it is hoped will be greatly expanded and intensified, first by the support of regular counterpart funds and to an ever increasing extent by German appropriated funds." 8/

What became of Garnett's plans?

#### The Course of Events

Here we need to turn back in our story to pick up some of the events that had taken place before Garnett submitted his plans. During the fall of 1949

8/ Proposal For the Establishment of a German Federal Agricultural Research and Extension Service with 5 percent Counterpart Funds. Feb. 8, 1950, Pp. 1-2.



Garnett and Williams had spent a great deal of time with Prof. Dr. Frederick Maier-Bode and his colleague Dr. Hans-Georg Littmann in developing an agricultural production program for West Germany. Littmann had been the head of the Production Department of the Ministry under the provisional German Government and in this capacity had worked closely with Williams, who was charged with this area of responsibility under HICOG (Office of U. S. High Commissioner for Germany). When the new German Government was established in the fall of 1949, Dr. Maier-Bode had been designated to replace Dr. Littmann as the head of Department II (production); but inasmuch as Maier-Bode and Littmann were good friends and had a mutual respect for one another's abilities, arrangements were made for Littmann to remain with the Ministry as one of Maier-Bode's chief assistants; and Littmann and Williams continued to function in much the same way as they had in the days of the provisional government. Maier-Bode and Garnett were colleagues at a somewhat higher level.

The hopes of getting an early release of regular counterpart funds to launch the various projects of the new agricultural program faded with the passage of time, particularly for projects requiring a grant-in-aid type of financing. The ECA bilateral agreement between the two countries specified that all funds had to be repaid to the United States by the German Government. There was no provision for grants-in-aid. Under these conditions the Germans were not prepared to embark on projects such as the establishment of a federal extension service. They took the position that, if the money had to be repaid, it must be invested in projects that would themselves earn enough money to make repayment. This stalemate continued over a considerable period of time and frustrated all those who wished to get an extension plan into action.

As the fall months of 1949 passed, Garnett in desperation decided to seek permission of higher headquarters to use some of the monies from the "Five Percent Administrative Fund" for financing his extension service project. 9/ He felt that he could wait no longer for regular counterpart funds to be freed for grant-in-aid purposes.

#### Garnett's Proposal to Higher Headquarters

On February 8, 1950, Gwynn Garnett wrote to the European Headquarters of ECA in Paris as follows:

"I am inclosing a draft of a proposal to use 5 percent counterpart funds for establishing a German Federal Agricultural Research and Extension Service. I feel that if we are to establish adaptation of the U. S. concept for extension service during the ECA period that an early start must be made. It looks now as though we will not get regular counterpart funds at

---

9/ Norman Smith was instrumental in suggesting this financial approach to Garnett. By law 5 percent of all counterpart funds were set aside for administrative purposes of ECA. ECA officials had considerable discretion as to how these funds could be expended.



best before fall. If a broad and worthwhile extension program is to be conducted during the winter of 1950-51 preparation must be begun in the very near future. I will appreciate receiving your comments on the project as well as its suitability for 5 percent counterpart funds.

"The 2,500,000 DM for publications will no doubt seem high. There are two reasons for this. One is that I would like to experiment with a wide, free distribution of farmer publications which in itself is an innovation into German agriculture, and second there has been virtually a dearth of farm publications or even agricultural technical publications since early in the war and there is a great need to fill up this gap in the shortest possible time.

In discussing this program with the Germans, I have made it clear that we would reserve one page in each publication for ECA. I believe this would give us a vehicle for publicizing ECA activities and objectives in Western Germany." 10/

The budget that Garnett proposed for a German Federal Agricultural Research and Extension Service for 1950 indicated in detail what was to be expected of the new organization: 11/

1. Personnel

<u>No. of Persons</u>	<u>Salary</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Grand Total</u>
	13,00 DM	13,00 DM	
2	10,500	21,000	
10	9,500	95,000	
4	9,200	36,800	
5	7,400	37,000	
2	6,600	13,200	
5	6,200	31,000	
10	5,100	51,000	
6	4,400	26,400	
<u>45</u>			<u>325,000 DM</u>

2. Publications: Bulletins, pamphlets, leaflets,  
for farmers and extension workers . . . . . 2,500,000

10/ Letter from Gwynn Garnett to Ben Thibodeaux, Director of Food and Agriculture Division, ECA, Paris, France, February 8, 1950.

11/ Proposal for the Establishment of a German Federal Agricultural Research and Extension Service with 5 percent Counterpart Funds. OP. P-3-5., February, 1950.

3. Land Extension Service: Agricultural extension service for Laender of the British and French Zones. This expenditure would of course depend upon reaching agreement with the Germans of these Laender and the Federal Government for establishing extension services that reach minimum standards of organization and operation to accomplish the objectives . . . . . 800,000
4. Films, Slides, and Equipment: It costs approximately 50,000 DM to prepare a 16-millimeter film. This expense would involve the preparation of both color and black and white movies, slides and lecture materials to accompany slides . . . . . 400,000
5. Farm Surveys: This activity involves farmer attitude and opinion surveys as a basis for guiding extension activities and farm management surveys particularly on farms from 5 to 10 hectares . . . . . 100,000
6. Agricultural Research: With emphasis upon the adaption of foreign agricultural research results to German conditions in animal feeding, fertilizer application, greenland improvement, and hay making and preservation, all of which would yield the quickest results . . . . . 300,000
7. Specialist Training: It is the design of this expenditure to conduct conferences and short courses providing the most up-to-date information on subject matter and teaching techniques for subject matter specialists of the Laender or to send specialists to conduct conferences and short courses in the Laender . . . . . 75,000
8. Establishment of International Technical Agricultural Library . . . . . 50,000
9. Information Services for radio, press and farm publications and the preparation and dissemination of a periodical for extension workers and educators in agriculture . . . . . 75,000
10. Administrative Costs including stationery, equipment, postage, telephone and telegraph, transportation and traveling expenses . . . . . 75,000
11. Building Construction: This expenditure is not an absolute essential to establishing the project. It is believed, however, that it would add a very important psychological impetus to the work; it would lend permanency to the endeavor; would facilitate the operation by providing a structure

with office space and conference rooms which is extremely scarce under present German conditions; and would provide a focal point for ECA publicity . . .	<u>500,000</u>
TOTAL . . . . .	5,200,000

In his proposal, Garnett justified his project and the expenditure of five-percent counterpart funds thus:

"Many and continuous efforts have been made to provide limited funds for such activities during the last year. However, now that the idea of extension service has taken root in a number of Kreise, more money is needed immediately to keep the program growing and to extend the service to other areas. It now appears that some counterpart funds will be made available in regular means but these will probably not become available before late fall or winter 1950.

It is therefore recommended that '5 percent counterpart funds' be used to make a modest beginning so as to make possible a full scale, worthwhile extension program during the winter of 1950/51.

Experiences to date in the U. S. Laender have led to the conclusion that the U. S. concept of extension work is new to German thinking; however, after having been thoroughly exposed to the idea through German experts studying the system in the U. S. A., it is an acceptable technique among Germans. Therefore, it is believed that the immediate support of this project would bridge the gap between reorientation funds and German appropriated funds expected to become available. It is believed that with reasonable support to provide good services the extension idea would be perpetuated with German support.

It is further believed that with the utilization of 5 percent counterpart funds, this information organization can be used to inform the German population of the ECA aid and ECA objectives in Western Germany." 12/

Garnett concluded his appeal by stating that the project would inject new life into the German agricultural economy. In fact, he stated, unless funds were immediately made available, the progress already made would be jeopardized, as would farmer support for German appropriated funds to carry on this important service in the future. He added that it was a timely and important adjunct to the policy of the Occupation and of ECA.

#### Action on the Proposal

Garnett's proposal received sympathetic attention at the Paris ECA office. But it raised several important questions: (1) Was the German government



prepared to support the project permanently? (2) How much assistance would be needed from ECA? (3) How should the proposed service be organized? and (4) Was it legal to use five-percent counterpart funds for employing regular extension workers, making farm surveys, and constructing buildings?

The Paris office wanted answers to these questions before it took action. It was further restrained by the fact that the Office of European Economic Cooperation was cooperating with ECA in an extension service survey project. Under this project, teams of extension experts were making country-by-country surveys of extension work and preparing recommendations for expanding and improving extension service in each country. One of these teams was scheduled to visit Germany about the middle of March 1950. It seemed to the Paris office that full advantage should be taken of the judgment and experience of this team before an overall program for a German federal extension service was undertaken. 13/

In view of these circumstances the Paris office concluded that it would be wise to wait before taking action on the wider aspects of Garnett's proposal. On the other hand, it saw no reason why approval should not be granted for developing informational materials for extension purposes, such as bulletins, leaflets, films, and slides. It considered that the cost of these materials clearly could be paid out of five-percent counterpart funds without any question of legality and gave permission to use  $2\frac{1}{2}$  million DM for this purpose. With this action it laid the foundation for a new federal agricultural information service, which, when it finally was formed, was called the German Federal Agricultural and Home Economics Evaluation and Information Service (AID). 14/

The decision of the Paris office was conveyed to the ECA Mission in Germany on March 13, 1950. 15/ Garnett and his staff were disappointed that approval had been withheld on the overall proposal, but were gratified to get the go-ahead signal on preparing informational materials. Garnett's hopes for an overall federal research and extension service were never realized. In the early fall of 1950 he left Germany for the United States, and his plan was not again taken up formally with ECA. But, as the future was to reveal, he had played a major role in creating an organization of real benefit to German agriculture.

#### Implementation of the Paris Decision

One of the questions that Garnett, Williams, Maier-Bode, and Littman had had to contend with as they prepared the proposal for a federal extension service was a constitutional one. They had come face to face with a restriction in the new German constitution - that education was a function of the state governments. They had recognized, therefore, that there was always the possibility that the states might challenge the right of the federal government to

13/ This team made its survey in Germany as scheduled. Its findings tended to support later requests to ECA for extension activities.

14/ The German name is "Land Und Hauswirtschaftlicher Auswertungs Und Informationsdienst". The organization is generally referred to as AID.

15/ Letter of Ben H. Thibodeaux to Gwynn Garnett, March 13, 1950.

establish and maintain an educational agency such as an extension service and had resolved the question at least for the time being, by studiously avoiding the word "education" in the proposal and using the term "information." Actually, however, the question never became an issue between the state and the federal governments because the decision in Paris resulted in the development of an agricultural information service rather than a federal extension service as such.

The decision in Paris immediately raised a number of questions: Where was the money to come from to administer the new effort? What sort of organization should be created to perform this function? Who was to head up the new work? Was the money to be controlled and spent solely by the federal government?

Garnett solved his first problem of funds for administering the new program by going to the chief of the ECA Mission to Germany and explaining his predicament of having funds for a program but no funds for administration. The chief of the Mission quickly gave his approval for utilizing up to 10 percent of the  $2\frac{1}{2}$  million DM for service and administration costs.

Discussions on the type of organization to handle the new function followed. Littmann wanted a straight-line organization running from the federal government to the individual farmer. He had reservations about the efficiency and effectiveness of the state advisory systems, particularly those in the south of Germany. It seemed to him that the only way to guarantee an orderly and efficient delivery of informational material to farmers was by direct mail from the federal office. Maier-Bode and Garnett opposed this idea. They believed that the new organization should be established to service the state extension services. It was their considered judgment that the new activity and organization should be geared in with the extension machinery at the lower levels of government. If this was done, they felt, political support for the new service would develop at the state and county levels and, in turn, would lead to political and financial support at the federal level. In their judgement there was no other way to establish an information service that would survive. Littmann took note of their views but decided to experiment with his own idea by sending three or four bulletins direct to farmers when he had an opportunity.

While these discussions were taking place at the federal level, extension folk at the state level began to press for securing the new funds for the states. They argued that they were already producing popular farmer bulletins in limited quantities and that it was only logical that the federal government should divide the  $2\frac{1}{2}$  million DM, or at least a large proportion of it, among the states and let them expand this activity. Furthermore, they said, the states could use the money more effectively than the federal government because each state would develop only material specifically needed for that state whereas the federal government would tend to develop general bulletins of less value. Interestingly enough, Americans as well as Germans were divided on this point: many of the members of the ECA Agricultural Mission stationed in the various states joined with their German coworkers in the effort to secure the funds for



state use. Garnett and Williams were irritated with this provincialism exhibited by their countrymen and were forced to inform them that a firm decision had already been made to use the funds for a federal service. The pressure from the states subsided when the states were promised that they would have a voice in the operation of the new agency. 16/

Finally, after countless details had been ironed out, the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, and Forestry submitted to the ECA Mission a formal application for establishing a federal information service. It was approved and a letter of agreement was drawn up, which reads in part as follows:

"The ECA Mission to Germany awards under Letter of Agreement No. 13 a sum not to exceed DM 2,500,000 to make available technical and scientific agricultural publications (including film strips and sets of slides) to German farmers and other workers concerned with improving German agriculture."

"By your acceptance of this amount it is agreed that releases of funds to you and your expenditures therefrom shall be governed by the following conditions:

"1. This allocation is made for the purpose of financing a special series of publications designed to bring the German farmers and agricultural workers the most up-to-date and useful agricultural methods, techniques, and technical information. The subject matter of such publications should be those topics where improvements in farm practices offer the greatest possibilities for increasing the efficiency of German agriculture and total food production.

"2. The series shall be identified as publications of the Bundesministerium fuer Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Forsten (Ministry for Food, Agriculture and Forestry) but each publication shall make due acknowledgement satisfactory to the ECA Mission to Germany that its preparation and distribution free-of-charge has been financed by that Mission.

"3. A release of DM 100,000 to cover necessary administration and servicing expenses will be made in advance under conditions to be agreed in writing between yourself and the Chief of Food and Agriculture Division, ECA Mission.

"4. Subsequent releases will be made on the basis of the individual costs of preparation, publication and distribution of each bulletin, pamphlet, leaflet, film strip or set of slides." 17/

The agreement spelled out in detail the procedure to be followed in developing, preparing, and issuing bulletins and films, and in paying for them. 18/ It set a limit of 250,000 DM for administrative purposes. As a result of this grant, used in conjunction with additional federal administrative funds, AID (The Agricultural and Home Economics Evaluation and Information

---

16/ Smith reports that not only the states, but the farm organizations were greatly interested in taking on the extension and information job, and they tried very hard to obtain control of the funds.

17/ Letter of R. M. Hanes, Chief ECA Special Mission to Germany to Prof. Wilhelm Niklos, Minister of Food, Agriculture and Forestry, May 5, 1950.

18/ The procedure provided that ECA would review proposals for work to be done, and the draft copies of manuscripts and materials prior to their publication. This provision helped to promote a working relationship between the personnel of ECA and the new entity as well as giving ECA a measure of control.

Service) was launched on May 17, 1950.

### Littmann, the First Director of AID

The time had come to put someone in charge of the new activity. It seemed to Maier-Bode that Littmann was the logical choice for the job. He had worked closely and enthusiastically with Maier-Bode and the Americans in the planning stages of AID. He was a man of proven ability, who was held in high esteem by Germans and Americans alike. Furthermore he was a man of ideas, with a drive and enthusiasm that would be an indispensable quality for promoting the new activity.

The members of the ECA Mission were pleased with Maier-Bode's selection of Littmann to head up the new movement, but at the same time they held certain reservations. They recognized Littmann's sterling qualities and his strength of character. On the other hand, they felt that Littmann tended to be set in his views and that it might be difficult for him to accept new ideas. Furthermore, they knew that Littmann strongly favored the extension arrangement in northern Germany, which utilized Chambers of Agriculture and advisory "rings" - an arrangement that was questioned by some members of the Mission. Nonetheless, Littmann was appointed; and as time was to show, the reservations about him proved to have been groundless. He showed himself to have an open mind and picked up numerous ideas for the new undertaking on his ECA-sponsored trips to Holland, Denmark, and Belgium in the summer of 1950 and to the United States later in the year; his enthusiasm made him a veritable dynamo for the new project.

### An Organizational Decision

It had been decided to establish the new project as an integral part of the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, and Forestry, directly under the supervision of Prof. Maier-Bode, the head of the Production Department. The Americans, in particular, favored such an arrangement because (1) it would give Maier-Bode an opportunity to strongly support the new information effort, (2) the Ministry seemed the strategic place in which, at some later time, to expand AID into a complete extension service, and (3) the Ministry seemed the logical and natural location, in line with the pattern existing in the United States, where the federal extension service is part of the Department of Agriculture.

The German officials, Maier-Bode and Littmann, tended to favor this organizational arrangement. It was in accord with German organizational practice and the German concept of extension. To the Germans, extension work meant assistance on production matters; therefore AID properly should be placed in the Production Department. On the other hand, they had reservations about the wisdom of incorporating the new information service into the Ministry. Under the Nazi regime the information office of the Ministry had become a powerful voice for propaganda and had become highly unpopular with the rural people and their officials at the state and local levels. In view of this experience, repercussions might come from the states on such an organizational arrangement.



Nevertheless, a decision had to be made, and they decided to take a "calculated risk."

### The New Project Gets Underway

The first few months of AID were a challenging and arduous period. Littmann and his associates were eager to begin producing and distributing suitable publications and films, but they also had many administrative matters to attend to: Establishing a budget, finding capable workers, building an organization, and establishing working relationships with research institutions and advisory services.

Fortunately, Littmann had excellent assistance and support. Maier-Bode, despite his wide and heavy responsibilities, always found time to give guidance and support. The ECA Mission, too, worked closely with Littmann and the new enterprise. Norman Smith, one of Garnett's chief production men, was given the assignment of helping Littmann wherever possible.

Smith, a former farm-management specialist at Michigan State College, had always had a strong interest in the dissemination of agricultural information. At one time he had even considered becoming a farm radio operator. Consequently the new assignment appealed to him immensely. Whereas Garnett and Williams played the major roles in planning the new project, Smith will go down in the history of AID as the American who provided the followthrough and the important day-to-day counsel as problems arose. His task was not an easy one, for he had to function in two roles that frequently were not compatible - that of administrator and that of teacher-counselor. The record will show that his interest in agricultural information work and his devotion to AID and its purposes gave great support to the new movement.

The ECA Mission took yet another step to help insure the success of the new venture: it arranged for the services of Louis J. Franke, an American extension information specialist, for a three-month period in the late spring of 1950. His primary task was to counsel Littmann in his new undertaking. 19/

As Littmann went ahead with his task, it became clear that his ideas on procedure would not always coincide with those of his American advisors. Littmann wanted to organize on the basis of subject matter. He would have a section for crops and soils, one for livestock and poultry, another for economics and farm management, and so forth. In each section he would have specialists to prepare the necessary material. In his opinion, there was no other way to organize. If a subject-matter man with a doctor's degree was not capable of writing a bulletin in his field, who was? 20/ This organizational idea met head on with the orthodox American viewpoint that specialists

19/ In the following year, 1951, Herman F. Mertens followed Franke on a similar assignment. Still later, during 1952-53, Hadley Read, Information Specialist, FA Division, Paris, worked closely with officials of AID.

20/ Littmann was expressing more than merely an individual viewpoint. It was a German one tied closely to the prestige and status system. In German society a person without a doctor's degree has not rated very high in many professions and in the social structure. The field of agricultural information has been largely an undeveloped one. Consequently, it was practically impossible to find anyone with advanced degrees in this profession.

were also needed in the presentation field, and that many subject-matter specialists were incapable of translating or presenting their knowledge through the various information media. It developed that this issue was not an easy one to resolve.

Two other matters came in for serious discussion during these early months. One was the all-important matter of relations with other organizations; the other, with demonstration farms. Littmann remained firm in his belief that AID ought to distribute its publications directly to farm people. He also thought that AID ought to buy land and set up family-size demonstration farms although he was not as positive on this point. In each case, Franke and Smith counseled against the move.

As Franke's time for departure drew near, Garnett suggested that he write a memorandum to Littmann, setting forth his ideas on how to organize and operate AID. Franke did so. He counseled against a subject-matter organization within AID and urged Littmann to hire an information specialist, a publications editor, a visual-aids specialist, an illustrator, a radio worker, and someone trained in survey techniques. He also counseled against establishing demonstration farms but thought experimental farms might have some possibilities. Such farms would be places where individual practices were demonstrated but where no pretense was made of operating a family-sized model farm on a practical basis.

Franke also advised that the federal agricultural information service work with and through the state advisory systems, and he took great pains to set forth his reasons. The importance of the issue is revealed in the following excerpt from Franke's memo:

"You indicated that you expect to distribute your publications directly to farm people. From this I assume, perhaps erroneously, that you plan to bypass the established advisory organizations at the state and county level."

"This has some practical advantages, especially if you feel that the existing system is not doing effective work.

If I were director of the Service, I would plan my program with these considerations in mind:

1. I cannot depend on ECA grants-in-aid much past the development period. I must, therefore, look more and more to the Federal Ministry of Agriculture for financial support. Certainly I must look to the Ministry for support for both maintenance and expansion in the future.

2. To get this support the Service must 1) prove its worth and 2) gain popular acceptance among farm people.

3. There is not much time to gain this acceptance and therefore I must see that farm people get some practical benefits from the establishment of the Service as rapidly and as directly as possible. And they must know that these benefits originate with the Service, otherwise they will credit other organizations with my work.



4. Besides, I cannot be sure that if I turn the publications we issue over to the advisors for distribution, they will ever reach the people. My suspicion is that many of them will not.

5. Therefore, I will send the publications directly to the farm families, even though this is an expensive method of distribution. I will also see that the Service is identified with all information it compiles and disseminates.

At this point I would consider the other side of the picture:

1. After all, the advisory system is a long established one. It must be doing some good and have some popular support or the Federal and State ministries of agriculture would not continue to finance it.

2. I may gain the support of individual farmers, but I cannot organize them and, without an organization, how can they be heard? On the other hand the advisory system, through the Chambers, does have articulate support.

3. Do I want the Chambers and the Advisors to look upon the Service as a competing or a cooperating organization? Later on, after the Service is accepted and has gained public confidence, it may not matter; we will be strong enough to get ahead on our own. But right now I'd better accept the fact that the Chambers have a far stronger voice in government than the Service; if they get the idea that the Service is competing with them in the advisory field, they will also think we are competing with them for a budget at their expense. They would probably get the better of me right now. So I'd better establish and maintain friendly relations with them." 21/

Franke suggested five procedures in the event that Littmann still felt it necessary to send publications and other materials directly to farm families. These were steps designed to avoid offending extension workers and to establish good relations.

1. Send the advisory workers advance copies of everything on the direct mailing list. This would give them an opportunity to read the bulletins before they reach the farmers and safeguard them against embarrassing questions. It would protect the prestige of extension workers.

2. Develop and issue a loose leaf book entitled "The Handbook of Agriculture" for the advisors. This would contain the latest available information on agriculture, insecticide recommendations, formulas for making whitewash and so on. This would demonstrate to the Chambers and advisors the desire of AID to help them; it would also make the work of the advisors more effective.

3. Design a standard insignia and propose to the state ministries and Chambers, which issue publications, that it be used on all publications with variations - such as an outline map of the state - to identify the issuing agency. Plan to use this device on all publications issued by AID. In this way the Chambers would feel that AID was supplementing their advisory work.

4. On every possible occasion, enlist the cooperation of the advisors and show public deference to them.

5. Before undertaking any program, invite representatives of the advisory service in for a conference so they would feel that they have a part in the work.

Franke pointed out that establishing good relations from the start with the state extension services might aid AID greatly later on if it were expanded into a federal advisory service.

In discussing where to start, Franke suggested that the first move, once a staff was organized, might be to get out some publications. Concurrently the specialists and the information specialist could adapt the manuscripts to use by newspapers, radio, and magazines use and so start a special service to the press and radio. Franke then went on to advise (1) the development and use of 2 X 2 slides rather than slide films; (2) the production of a few movies to draw attendance at meetings, recommending that the work be contracted with commercial companies; (3) the establishment of a monthly publication pattern along the lines of the Extension Service Review in the United States; (4) the use of the demonstration-train technique to help bring AID to the attention of not only the farmers but the townspeople along the route.

In retrospect it is not clear whether Littmann was strongly influenced by Franke or not. Some observers feel that he was not. It can be said, however, that most of the ideas that Franke advocated were orthodox ones in American agricultural information circles. The agricultural information specialists who followed Franke to Germany tended to support these early recommendations. Besides, Littmann's visit to the United States in the fall of 1950, and Norman Smith's daily consultations, were important factors in the indoctrination process. As time progressed many of these ideas were accepted by Littmann.

#### The Financial Situation Improves

By August 1950 the question concerning the use of regular counterpart funds for grants-in-aid purposes in Germany had been resolved, and approval had been given by ECA to set up grants-in-aid projects. The ECA Mission in Germany took immediate advantage of the new situation and set up an AID project as part of the 1949-50 ECA program. This project provided 1 million DM for the new undertaking although one-half of this amount was not to be released until April 27, 1951. The amount was apportioned among various subprojects as follows:

	<u>DM</u>
Building lots and equipment of buildings (Bad Godesberg) . . . . .	350,000
Internal equipment, particularly a library . . . . .	50,000
Publication of technical assistance reports . . . . .	20,000



	<u>DM</u>
Advanced courses for extension service workers . . . . .	50,000
Establishment of a film service; pur- chases of publications, films, slides, and other material . . . . .	<u>530,000</u>
Total	1,000,000

In addition the project indicated that 500,000 DM would be available annually from German sources - 200,000 for personnel and maintenance of equipment and 300,000 for publications, courses, films, and so forth. 22/

#### Repercussions from the States

Littmann and his small staff had been working industriously, and the first farmers' bulletin was ready for distribution by the middle of September 1950. In succeeding months others followed in ever increasing numbers. Smith worked closely with Littmann and his staff, and together they developed a systematic exchange of extension-type publications between the United States and Germany. AID was supplied with United States pamphlets, books and agricultural film strips and slides; much of the material was put to direct use or served as models for layout and style. The American films and film strips were equipped with sound tracks in German. Publications were also obtained from the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

As we mentioned before, Littmann had not yet given up his idea of sending publications directly to farmers. Thus, as the bulletins began to roll off the presses, he decided to try out his scheme with a few bulletins. The response was instantaneous. The state ministries of food and agriculture, the Chambers of Agriculture, and the Agricultural Schools protested loudly against the procedure. Littmann concluded reluctantly that Maier-Bode's, Garnett's, and Franke's advice must be sound. Some observers, in looking back, say that this incident was a good thing. It created an intense interest and concern in AID's activities on the part of the farm organizations and the state advisory service. This concern was eventually to culminate in a demand for a new organizational arrangement for AID that would give the states a voice in its operation.

#### Littmann Visits the United States

Maier-Bode had visited the United States in the spring of 1949 and had returned home with numerous ideas on how to improve advisory work in West Germany. In the opinion of the ECA Mission his visit to America had helped

22/ Counterpart Funds Project for Agriculture, Economic year 1949/50  
"Establishment of the Agricultural and Home Economics Evaluation and  
Information Service". August 1, 1950.

sell Maier-Bode on the extension idea and had been a sizable factor in the support that Maier-Bode had given the AID cause.

It seemed important that the new director of AID should have a similar opportunity. Consequently, Littmann spent six weeks during the fall of 1950 in the United States, becoming better acquainted with extension work as it is carried out in that country. Littmann was particularly impressed with (1) the broad conception of extension work in the U. S.; (2) the organizational arrangement for the advisory service; (3) the close relationship of extension, research, and education; (4) the use of specialists; (5) the important part that lay people play in the program-planning process; and (6) the emphasis given to teaching in group situations and through mass media. 23/ Littmann returned to Germany "to put into practice what he had learned and during the remaining six months of his life did a remarkable job, not only of producing printed material on agricultural production intended for distribution to farmers and written and illustrated for a broad level of understanding but of selling the program to state officials." 24/

#### Growing Pains of the New Organization

By the spring of 1951 AID was rapidly becoming firmly established. The funds released in 1950 had permitted Littmann to organize the new undertaking and to get into production in a businesslike way. As in all organizations, however, problems continued to arise.

AID needed a home. Maier-Bode had been able to provide office space for Littmann and one or two secretaries in the early days of AID, but the situation gradually changed as AID grew in size. The ECA Mission and Littmann were eager that AID should have a place where it would have adequate room for its task. Fortunately, funds had been provided in the budget; and the problems were primarily technical in nature, involving choice of a site, type of building, and the like.

Darter, Smith, and some of the other members of the Mission were concerned about the status of AID and its relationship with other organizations. Convinced that there were still too many people who did not understand AID, or the services available through it, they thought that every opportunity should be taken to bring it to the attention of agricultural organizations and farmers. They felt that AID should have a status at least equal to that of a federal agricultural research institute so that AID could deal on an equal basis with those agencies from which it must obtain information. 25/

- 23/ Evaluation and Information Service for Agriculture and Home Economics. Report on the Results of the Technical Assistance Program. Brochure No. 5. Study Trip to the U. S. A. for the purpose of studying the Extension Service. Technical Assistance Project, OEEC-61 by Dr. Hans-Georg Littmann.
- 24/ Food and Agricultural Programs in West Germany. OP., P-166.
- 25/ Letter from Vernon W. Darter to Dr. Littmann, March 16, 1951.



One of the problems that continued to plague Littmann and his co-workers was relations with agricultural publishing houses, which seemed to find it difficult to understand the true functions of AID. They tended to feel that AID was encroaching on their field and giving unfair competition to legitimate business. Likewise, the German Agricultural Society, an organization that sponsored large agricultural fairs and published agricultural bulletins, looked with suspicion on the activities of AID. Littmann and his colleagues had the difficult task of convincing the officials of these establishments that the new agricultural information service did not represent a threat to their welfare and security but would actually be helpful to them.

As time went on, the issue of AID's relations with the state advisory services came more and more into the foreground. By June 1951 it had become clear to Maier-Bode and Littmann that a change in the organizational status of AID must take place if AID was to receive the support of the state extension services and function effectively. Their early apprehensions that rural people would be hostile to placing AID directly within the Ministry proved to have been well-founded. The "calculated risk" had failed. Bavaria, followed by the other states, virtually insisted that AID be separated from the Ministry. By late June 1951, meetings were in progress with representatives of the states to determine ways of bringing the states into fuller partnership with the federal government in the operation of AID. These discussions took several months, and it was December 1951 before the new plan of establishing AID as a "registered association" went into effect.

#### Progress of the New Undertaking

The progress of AID under Littmann's leadership was phenomenal. By the close of its first year it was making substantial progress in gaining the confidence of agricultural organizations and farm people. Herman F. Mertens, an American agricultural information specialist who had arrived in early January 1951 to work with Smith and Littmann on a six month's assignment, reported on AID's development in these words: 26/

"AID is the most important single organization in the farm information field in Germany, perhaps in Europe. This statement is based not only on close association with AID but also on surveys of information work in each of the Federal Republic's Laender (states), and on reports from persons familiar with agricultural information work in other European countries.

"AID is the only governmental organization on the national level in Germany now preparing printed material on agricultural production intended for distribution to farmers and written and illustrated for a broad level of understanding, especially among farmers.

26/ Mertens was an ECA "Type A" Technical Assistance specialist whose assignment was to "have his headquarters at the Federal Institute for Farm and Home Economics Extension Information". His assignment called for him "to work with groups of German subject matter specialists in the development of publications and visual aids and to advise and to assist in the preparation of manuscripts".



"It is the only organization that has been able to make appreciable strides toward gaining the cooperation of all the Laender in this field. It is in a better position than any other organization to influence the direction of advisory work on a national basis, toward achieving specific goals. In its first year of existence, AID has laid the foundation for what can eventually be developed into a truly effective national extension service for Germany. It has the possibility, with cooperation of the Laender and working through the Laender, of vastly improving the farm advisory system of the entire Federal Republic.

"I mention these things to emphasize the importance of "carrying on" AID's job. An excellent beginning has been made, and it is extremely vital that the investment thus far made in time, money and human effort not be lost.

"The remarkably fine record made by AID in a single year is due to a number of things. First should be mentioned the broad vision and diligent labors of the late Dr. Hans-Georg Littmann, AID's first director. (Dr. Littmann was killed in an auto accident in June 1951.) Full credit should be given also to the loyalty, hard work and cooperative spirit of AID's staff. The support which AID has received from the Federal Ministry of Agriculture has also been of utmost importance. The financial aid of ECA counterpart funds, and the encouragement of the Food and Agriculture Division of the ECA Mission to Germany have been extremely valuable during the infancy of the organization." 27/

Mertens also had some suggestions for making the organization's record even better:

1. Expand the press and radio phase of the program immediately.
2. Expand the work of assisting advisors in the techniques of effective advisory work.
3. Reorganize AID into three main divisions: (1) Administration, (2) evaluation, (3) information. The evaluation division would contain the subject matter specialists of AID. It would be charged with providing expert knowledge in subject matter and with evaluating the effects and reception of AID's own material by the farmer and his family. The information division would provide the expert techniques in the information field - the "how to say it" knowledge. 28/

Also in his report Mertens paid homage to Dr. Littmann's skillful direction in preparing printed material distinguished for its simplicity, readability, and extensive use of pictures. Then he offered a few guides that might be helpful:

- 1) Pick a purpose - and stick to it.
- 2) Know the interests of your audience - and appeal to them.

---

27/ Herman F. Mertens. Methods of Disseminating Agricultural Information, Project Report of ECA Technical Assistance Project No. 07-41. July 12, 1951.  
28/ As indicated earlier, Littmann had organized AID on a subject-matter basis.

- 3) Keep it simple.
- 4) Keep it brief but complete.
- 5) Keep it human - definite - complete.
- 6) Prefer photographs to drawings.
- 7) Stress the positive.
- 8) Test farmer reaction.

#### New Leadership and Continued ECA Financial Support

Littmann's death in early June 1951 in an automobile accident in Paris was a serious blow not only to his friends and associates but to the AID cause as well. In some respects, Littmann's personality and strong leadership had given AID the reputation of being a one-man organization. Consequently, his death represented a tremendous loss to the new undertaking. Who was there to take his place?

Maier-Bode decided to place Dr. Kurt Petrich, one of his capable administrative assistants, in charge of the new operation. Petrich was to function as Director of AID as well as to carry on some of his old duties under Maier-Bode. Petrich, who had made administration his career, had worked for Maier-Bode for many years and their relationship was close. To Maier-Bode this appointment seemed to maximize his opportunities both for **keeping** informed on AID's progress and for giving guidance and advice at strategic times.

One of Petrich's first duties was to meet with members of the ECA Mission concerning an additional counterpart-fund grant. The Ministry was contributing to AID's budget but was not in a position to shoulder the entire cost. Arrangements progressed satisfactorily and on August 6, 1951, the Ministry and the Mission signed a new project agreement which provided 500,000 DM from regular counterpart funds for AID's use. This sum was allocated to subprojects as follows:

	<u>DM</u>
For fixtures and fittings, including libraries . . . . .	50,000
For evaluation and investigations on advisory methods and results . . .	40,000
For publication of technical assist- ance reports . . . . .	75,000
For advanced courses of extension service workers . . . . .	70,000



For extending and operating the film service . . . . .	110,000	
For making, purchasing, sharing, and issuing other materials . . . . .	100,000	
For the publication of research results and other work . . . . .	<u>55,000</u>	
Total . . . . .	500,000	<u>29/</u>

Smith and some of his associates on the Mission's staff had not forgotten Garnett's dream of a federal extension service for West Germany. They hoped that in time AID might expand in its functions and make this dream a reality. The present arrangement of two small extension offices, one for agriculture and one for home economics at the federal level, plus AID seemed unrealistic. In their opinion, all three should be in one tightly knit unit. Maier-Bode was sympathetic to this idea, but maintained that the time was not ripe for such consolidation, that personalities and attitudes within the Ministry made it politically unwise. Inasmuch as all three units fell under Maier-Bode's jurisdiction, it did not appear to be a pressing matter. 30/

The discussions between the federal government and the states concerning the future organizational status of AID had been followed closely by the Americans. There was some apprehension on the part of the Mission that the states might force a complete separation of AID and the Ministry. Such separation might spell the doom of any plan for eventually expanding AID into a federal extension service. Likewise, it might result in a loss of financial and other support from the Ministry.

As a result of this thinking, the new project agreement between the Ministry and the ECA Mission spelled out, in some detail, the purposes of AID and its organizational relationships with the Ministry. It represented another attempt to secure effective coordination between information and extension. The broader purposes were stated as follows: (1) To strengthen and coordinate the work of the advisory service in agriculture and rural home economics and with rural youth and (2) to coordinate to a greater extent the work of the agricultural advisory service (including rural home economics and rural youth) in the work of various institutions engaged in agricultural education and research, thereby improving the service of all to the German farmer.

On the organizational issue the project agreement said that -

"AID shall be a part of the Federal Agricultural Advisory Service and not a separate association.

29/ Food and Agricultural Programs in West Germany. OP. P-166.

30/ While all the Americans on Garnett's staff had strongly supported Garnett's leadership in trying to establish a federal extension service from the very beginning, there was some difference of opinion within the Mission concerning the urgency of bringing the various elements together. Smith, for instance, continued to regard the issue as a pressing one.

"It shall function as the Advisory Information arm of the Federal Republic and shall be under the direction of the Federal Director of the Advisory Service (the Mission considered Maier-Bode as the Federal Director). In this capacity it will cooperate and coordinate with both the Federal and Land Advisory Service in an effort to provide advisory personnel at all levels with practical informational material that they can use in their work with farmers. AID shall also, as necessary, send certain informational material directly to the farmers. The normal channel for distribution, however, shall be through the Land Ministry and Land Advisory Service to the farmers. The building planned herein for AID shall have provisions for housing the Federal Advisory Specialists especially those who will be employed from ECA counterpart Funds. With this arrangement there will be achieved an integrated Advisory Service on the Federal level which shall coordinate and cooperate with the Land Advisory Service in such a way as to strengthen and coordinate the entire extension system on all levels." 31/

#### Petrich Visits the United States

It was considered important that Petrich, like Littmann before him, should have an opportunity to become better acquainted with United States extension information methods. 32/ He left Germany on August 16, 1951, and spent six weeks in the United States. Two things occurred during his visit that need recording here. He met Prof. Hadley Read, Director of Agricultural Information of the University of Illinois, and Mr. Dana Reynolds, top agricultural information man of ECA in Washington. Read spent considerable time acquainting Petrich with the agricultural advisory system in the United States and its arrangements for handling agricultural information. The two men soon became good friends. At a later date, while serving as Information Specialist in the ECA Food and Agriculture Division, Paris, Read worked closely with Petrich on AID's development.

Petrich's visit with Dana Reynolds was a pleasant and stimulating occasion. Reynolds opened the discussion by referring to German thoroughness and originality. He cautioned Petrich against accepting everything that he saw in the United States on agricultural information techniques and procedures. Some of the things that American agricultural information people advocated, he said, were wrong. It was Reynolds' opinion, based on 25 years' experience, that the United States still had a long ways to go in perfecting an agricultural information system.

Petrich's interest was immediately quickened by this advice, and he wanted to know how the American system could be improved. Reynolds said that, in his opinion, the orthodox extension arrangement in America tended to leave the

---

31/ Project No. III D. Agricultural Extension, Education and Research, Promotion of AID. Aug. 6, 1951.

32/ At a later date the Technical Assistance Program was to bring several other members of AID's staff to the United States for study. Some of these people were Mr. Willi Ernst Volling, Mr. Klaus Friedrich Von Werder, Miss Ulla Cascilie Dresbach, and Mr. Wolfgang Paul George Neinhaus.



information person on the sidelines of activity, too far removed from the administrative and subject-matter people. Reynolds went on to say that he had never met a subject-matter specialist who did not know a lot about getting his subject across to farm people, that most of them knew what the educational problems were. In his opinion, it was unethical for information specialists to preach the contrary. He strongly felt that the relations between information and subject-matter people should be close, that, if they worked together, the information program could be tied in closely with actual problems. In his opinion, the philosophy should be one of starting with the basic problems and then determining the information approach. Petrich was impressed with Reynolds' views. It seemed to him that they tended to reinforce Littmann's reasons for organizing AID on a subject-matter basis.

### AID Becomes a "Registered Association"

By December 1951 the discussions between the state and federal representatives concerning AID's organizational status had produced a satisfactory agreement: AID would be established as a "registered association" and its name would be entered in the municipal court register but it would remain under the supervision of the Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture, and Forestry. The new arrangement was designed to give the states and the farm organizations a chance to participate in the direction of AID's work.

Some of the more important provisions of the statute for the new organization were as follows:

Purpose and Tasks. -- The purpose and function of AID, in the phraseology of the statute, was as follows:

"The association is of public utility. It has the task to collect the results of agricultural, home economics and food research in cooperation with the Federal Ministry for Food, Agriculture and Forestry, the Highest Land Authorities and the professional organizations of food, agriculture and home economics, as well as the agricultural cooperatives, in order to evaluate them and to make them available to advisory and practical work."

Organization. -- AID was to have (1) an Assembly of Members; and (2) a Board of Directors.

The Assembly of Members was to consist of 38 people, 24 to be designated by the state ministries of food and agriculture and 14 by the leading farm organizations of West Germany. In addition, the head of the Production Department of the federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture, and Forestry was to be a member of this group. The Assembly of Members was empowered to (1) select and appoint a board of directors, (2) determine the budget, (3) take final action on the annual report and budget, (4) receive moneys for AID from a third party, (5) act on motions for changes in the statute, and (6) dissolve the association if deemed desirable.

The Board of Directors was to consist of a president, vice president, and five other members. Four of the members were to represent the state ministries

of food and agriculture and two were to represent farm organizations. The statute specified that one of the two from farm organizations should be a woman. The president of the Board was to be the Chief of the Production Department of the federal Ministry. Article 8 stated that the Board of Directors was responsible for the management of AID in accordance with the statute and within the frame of the AID budget established by the Assembly of Members. The Board of Directors was charged with the appointment of a manager, who had to be a member of the federal Ministry.

The manager or director of AID was to conduct the current transactions in accordance with the statute and the instructions of the Board of Directors and the Assembly of Members. He was to participate in the meetings of these bodies in an advisory capacity.

Finances and Supervision. -- The statute provided that the financial requirements of AID would be met by subsidies from the federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture, and Forestry and by appropriations from other sources. Board members were to serve without salary, receiving reimbursement only for their expenses. Article 13 provided that AID was to be supervised by the federal Ministry for Food, Agriculture, and Forestry. 33/

#### Internal Organization and Progress of AID, December 31, 1951 34/

The rapid growth that AID had shown under Littmann's leadership continued under the new management. The purposes, responsibilities, and organizational status of AID had become clearer. The output of bulletins and films increased month by month.

By December 31, 1951, AID had produced 40 different publications, totaling 21 million copies. Most of them were concerned with agricultural production. It had a library of some 52 films, including several it had produced itself; a large number of American and English films, which had been synchronized with German sound; and a few older agricultural films, which had been carefully edited. The films were available for the use of all persons and organizations. Six mobile film units of the service facilitated the showing of the films and worked closely with the state agencies. By December 31, 1951, these units had held 712 showings to more than 59,000 visitors.

AID had also prepared 7 sets of 2 X 2 slides on important topics and was assembling 77 more. These were available for loan or purchase.

A start had been made on a press and radio service.

The specific responsibilities of AID had crystallized into the following:

1. Keeping informed on the current problems and difficulties of the farm and rural population by getting into close contact

---

33/ Statute of AID, December, 1951.

34/ Summary of the Food and Agricultural Situation in the Federal Republic of Germany, June 1952 - P-11.



with the farmers.

2. Informing research stations of the problems and difficulties.

3. Collecting the available research results both at home and abroad, evaluating them, and making them available to the agricultural advisory service, all farms (through the agricultural advisory service), all other interested agencies.

4. Supplying proper materials to institutions for improving agriculture, such as the advisory service, technical and commercial organizations, the cooperatives, and industry.

5. Studying organizations, methods, and results of advising; evaluating them and making the results available to all interested parties.

6. Taking care of the foreign agricultural specialists on technical assistance assignments in the country.

7. Organizing the exhibits of the federal Ministry for Food, Agriculture, and Forestry. 35/

At the end of 1951 the internal structure of AID provided for eight divisions: Administration, theory of agricultural management, field and plant cultivation, animal breeding and feeding, agricultural mechanization and special fields, home economics and family life, information system and radio service, and office for foreign agricultural technicians. Each division was headed by an expert in its field. Its staff consisted of 33 people. 36/

In addition, working parties had been created to work in the fields of farm management, plant cultivation, grassland and fodder economy, animal production, production of quality produce, and home economics. They were assigned to work closely with the divisions of AID in the planning and development of appropriate publications and films. 37/ Members of these committees had been proposed by the state ministers.

As the promoters of the AID cause reviewed the accomplishments of the new organization, it seemed to them that AID had done a good job - yet much remained to be done. There seemed to be at least three areas that needed attention: (1) Relationships with the colleges; (2) the need to capitalize on the power of the independent press and radio; and (3) closer relations with the advisory system. Out of this situation grew plans for a press-radio workshop, a greenland campaign, and an agricultural journalism shortcourse.

---

35/ The AID. Its Foundation, Organization, Responsibilities, Activities and its Criticism from Outside. (17 May 1950 - 31 December 1951), P 1-2.

36/ Ibid., P 2-3.

37/ Kurt Petrich. "Functions of AID in Western Germany". An address before an international extension conference in Bonn, December 1951, P-3.



## Developments During 1952

Most of the developments during 1952 took place according to plan. Three events were outstanding: An information meeting in February to work out closer working relations between AID and the press, radio, ministries, and farm organizations, (2) a workshop in March with representatives of the press, radio, advisory services, farm organizations, and ministries to develop an "improved greenland" program for encouraging farmers to improve their pastures, and (3) a 12-week course, from July 15 to October 15, on agricultural information methods.

These sessions turned out to be very successful affairs. The information meeting in February laid the groundwork for cooperative effort. The workshop in March put into operation the plans made in January and revealed the important role that AID might play in educational campaigns. The agricultural-information short course during the summer and early fall months was the first of two steps to develop trained agricultural information people for the colleges, farm papers, farm radios and AID. 38/ Smith and Petrich had taken the lead in initiating and sponsoring these activities. 39/ Dana Reynolds and Wallace Kadderly, key agricultural information men of the Washington and Paris ECA offices, respectively, had given strong support technically and administratively. 40/ Arrangements had been made for adequate technical assistance. Hadley Read, from the University of Illinois, arrived in time to help make the plans for the agricultural journalism short course. Bryant Kearn, chairman of the Department of Agricultural Journalism of the University of Wisconsin, arrived in early July to conduct the 12-week short course. 41/

38/ The plan had two primary purposes. One was to develop and establish skilled agricultural information specialists in the seven German agricultural universities. Their task, in turn, would be one of training present and future extension workers in information methods. A second purpose of the plan was to help develop a supply of trained agricultural information people for farm papers, farm radios, and AID. The first part of the plan called for this short course on agricultural information methods in Germany. The second part provided for a three month's study course in the United States. During January of 1953, seven people came to the United States in accordance with this plan.

39/ It should be pointed out, however, that Petrich had had some rather grave concerns about whether or not AID was yet strong enough to withstand what he was afraid would be some rather heavy criticism from the independent press and radio people. It had taken considerable persuasion upon the part of Smith to get Petrich to agree to the press-radio information meeting in February.

40/ The Washington and Paris ECA/MSA offices have strongly supported the AID movement from its inception. Reynolds and Kadderly, in particular, have given strong support to the movement. Kadderly, being strategically located, has been able to visit Smith and Petrich at relatively frequent intervals to assist and advise on AID's development.

41/ Competent observers give Professor Kearn unlimited credit for (1) defining and clarifying the technical concepts of technical agricultural journalism, and (2) solidifying the tremendous opportunities and advantages in closer relationships with the German universities.

While these events were taking place, a number of administrative problems required attention. One involved the housing of AID's personnel. The transfer of the federal government from Frankfurt to Bonn created a housing shortage in Bonn and its suburbs. The federal government proceeded to solve the difficulty by embarking on a housing project for its employees. The new status of AID as a "registered association," however, meant that its staff was not eligible to apply for rooms in these government apartment houses. Petrich was faced with a difficult personnel problem. Unable to find a ready solution, he took his problem to Maier-Bode and Smith for advice and assistance.

The big problem that had bothered Smith and his coworkers in the Mission for months and was increasingly bothering Petrich was the problem of finances. Thus far, ECA and its successor, MSA, had contributed 4 million DM and the federal government approximately 800,000 DM. How was AID to be financed in the future?

Smith had hoped to solve the financial problem on a more or less permanent basis through the use of interest money from a large counterpart agricultural credit project. Ninety-five million DM of counterpart funds had been deposited for the use of agricultural mortgage banks and agricultural cooperation banks. The loans were made by banks at a rate of 6-percent. The costs of operation were approximately 1-1/2 percent, leaving about 4-1/2 percent clear. Smith figured that 4-1/2 percent times 95 million DM would produce approximately 4-1/4 million DM per year for the operation of AID with some to spare for the advisory services. He felt that AID would need about 2 million DM per year. According to the plan, the money would be handed over to the Ministry of Food, Agriculture, and Forestry by the banks; and the Ministry, in turn, would make allocations to AID and the advisory services.

The success of Smith's plan depended on getting agreement to utilize the 95 million DM as grants-in-aid to the banks with an interest payment specification. This would have made a permanent addition to the capital reserves of the banks, and the interest would have continued to flow indefinitely for the support of AID. Unfortunately for Smith's plan, agreement could not be reached to use these funds for grant-in-aid purposes. The government held that the funds had to be used as normal credit loans, which meant that they had to be repaid and that the revenue from interest would drop year by year. The contention was that since, in the end, the funds would actually be issued as credit, it would be impossible to initially give them to the credit agencies as a grant-in-aid.

Eventually the finance problem was temporarily resolved by the Finance Minister - by the entire cabinet, in fact - when he agreed to include in the annual extraordinary budget an amount equal to the interest return on 95 million DM for the use of AID and the advisory services. This budget, of course, is subject to the review and action of Parliament. The agreement did not provide the absolute security for AID's future that Smith had desired, but it did indicate that AID had made considerable progress in gaining the confidence and respect of some of the leading political figures of the country.



As the fall of 1952 approached, Hadley Read, who had been working closely with Petrich and Smith, offered his suggestions for the continued progress and welfare of AID: 42/

1. Prepare more subject-matter reference material, i.e., basic agricultural looseleaf handbooks, for use by advisory workers, teachers in agricultural schools, and agricultural leaders.
2. Spearhead three or four major educational programs or campaigns each year.
3. Give increased attention to a program of visiting research centers, briefing and digesting research reports, compiling a library of research materials, and issuing a digest service to all agricultural scientists in Germany.
4. Speed up, improve, and develop the press service to newspapers and magazines.
5. Develop a service to radio stations.
6. Supply county advisory workers with information on editorial methods and materials.
7. Prepare a monthly feature-length article, with pictures, for each farm magazine.
8. Develop an outstanding library of black and white agricultural photographs and take over the task of planning, writing, and shooting of narrative scripts for motion pictures.
9. Hire at least one full-time graphics man or artist.
10. Plan and prepare small, simple exhibits for the use of county advisory workers.
11. Plan and carry out training programs in the field of agricultural information methods for county advisory workers.

Read concluded by stating: "AID has experienced an unusually successful growth during the brief period of its operation. During recent months, new services have been undertaken and still others are planned for the future. There is an opportunity now to consider whether shifts in the administrative structure of AID might not result in more effective and efficient use of personnel and funds. 43/

42/ Smith states "Professor Read made these suggestions at my request. The effort was made in this way since I felt that because he was not a part of the Mission's administrative staff, and was held in high esteem by Petrich, he might, through this approach, achieve an organizational change, which I and others had advocated for some time".

43/ Hadley Read. "Opportunities for the Continued Development of AID". A report addressed to Norman L. Smith, August 20, 1952.



Then, following in the footsteps of his predecessors, Franke and Mertens, he suggested that AID be reorganized into three divisions: (1) Administrative, (2) subject-matter development, and (3) editorial services. Petrich and his staff took Read's recommendations under advisement. 44/

### Accomplishments by the Fall of 1952

"While the first year was taken up by creating the foundations for this new institution, the second year served to expand newly established relations, to strengthen the internal organization, and to broaden and deepen the efficiency of AID by a large number of publications and other services." 45/

Organizationally AID had continued to follow "the principle of keeping information and evaluation within the different fields of subjects." 46/ Some modifications had taken place in the internal structure to meet the constantly expanding work of AID, but this principle had been adhered to. There were departments for arable farming and plant growing; breeding, keeping, and feeding of animals; agricultural engineering and special fields; house keeping and family; industrial management; and information. In addition, there was an Office of the Director for administrative purposes. The staff had doubled in the course of a year and by October 1952 consisted of 48 members. It was now officed in its new building at Bad Godesburg, a building especially constructed for its use.

The output of the new information service was substantial. More than 20 million pamphlets and booklets, an average of 10 publications per farmer, had been distributed. AID movie-shows and an undetermined number of circulation film shows had been attended by 110,000 farm people. The resources of the film distribution library had increased to 54 films.

A comprehensive distribution system had been developed for AID's publications. Seventeen different groupings were on the mailing list. Some of these were the state ministries of agriculture, the Chambers of Agriculture, the Agricultural Schools, Associations of Country Women, professional schools of agriculture, broadcasting stations, foreign states, and so on.

44/ According to members of the MSA Mission, other individuals who have influenced AID's work along the lines of United States experience include:

1. Mr. Fritz Albert of the AID staff who studied agricultural information in the United States for one year.
  2. Prof. W. A. Sumner of the University of Wisconsin. While he was in Bonn, Germany for a few days, he is credited by many not only with inspiring AID personnel but also with precipitating action on plans to establish chairs of agricultural information.
  3. Mr. Franz Winter, farm program director of Radio Cologne. Winter picked up many of his ideas and much of his enthusiasm while on a technical assistance trip to the United States. He was instrumental in helping to promote the AID press-radio meeting in 1952.
- 45/ AID Annual Report, 1951-52.  
46/ Ibid.

The publications included booklets, periodicals, posters, and reports on visits of German agriculturists to foreign countries under the ECA/MSA technical assistance program. In addition, AID was publishing its house organ AID - Rundschau on a monthly basis and Nutzen und Ordnung, a magazine for women teachers at the agriculture schools, at the rate of 8 issues per year. It was also getting out a monthly "Farm Market - National Economy" review.

The subject-matter of the various bulletins and films ranged far and wide in the fields of agriculture, home economics, and youth work. Special care had been taken to insure adequate attention to the activities of the farm women and rural youth. The following titles of a few publications give some indication of the scope of activity: The Know-How of Good Housekeeping, Village Community House, Why Forage Planning, Improvement in Agriculture, Methods Employed in the Guidance of Small and Very Small Farm Holdings, and Study Trip to the USA for the Study of the Extension Service. Films included The Milking Machine Helps, Potato Growing, Luck in the Pigsty, and From Chicken to Poulet. The films were based primarily on small and medium-size farms, the most common form of agricultural enterprise in West Germany.

In addition to its work on publications and films, AID had entered into the field of educational campaigns as we have mentioned earlier - the greenland campaign, for example. It had also begun to play a leading role in developing and putting on agricultural exhibitions. It had participated actively in (1) an exhibition at the meeting of the German Agricultural Society in May of 1951, (2) "Cruene Woche" agricultural exhibitions in Berlin in January 1952, and (3) in an exhibit of a "model farm" and a "house of the farm women" in Hamburg. These experiences had been very successful ones.

AID's library of agricultural technical books had gone past the 1,200 figure. It had made arrangements through the courtesy of ECA to secure foreign professional literature for its own use and for distribution to university and research institutions in West Germany.

Steps had been taken, as we have indicated, to work out closer relationships with the press and radio stations. In this connection a weekly information service had been set up, which furnished brief news items about the work of AID to the German News Agency, radio stations, and to dailies and professional magazines. In fact, the AID information service reports not only on the work of AID, but on all promotional measures for German agriculture.

The size of AID by the fall of 1952 can be indicated in financial terms. The plans of AID for the fiscal year 1952-53 called for an expenditure of approximately 1.3 million DM for its technical work.

The development of AID has been a cooperative effort of the German government and the Mission. The assistance of ECA/MSA in this enterprise has been deeply appreciated by the Ministry.

"Stress is to be laid on the special interest displayed by ECA - later MSA - Mission in the development of the AID. The chief of the MSA Production Branch of the Department for Food and Agriculture, Mr. Norman L. Smith, not only took a great interest in



the work of the AID, but also paved the ways and extended every assistance with expert advice. It is recognized with gratitude that the major part of the costs for the publication of booklets, for the production of films, and the holding of meetings was financed out of ECA funds. The office building of the AID has also been constructed with the aid of Marshall Plan funds. Films and image bands, American magazines and technical literature were made available to a great extent. Within the scope of the Technical Assistance Program, not only a number of German experts traveled to the U. S. for study purposes, but also American experts came to Germany for consultation and were entertained by the AID. Special attention should be paid to the activities of Mr. Herman F. Mertens, who for 6 months put his experience in the field of the agricultural information system into the service of the construction work of the AID". 47/

### Retrospect

The people who have participated in the development of AID are proud of what they have accomplished. They point with pride not only to AID's accomplishments in Germany, but to its influence in improving agricultural information work on the continent. 48/

While there is a sense of satisfaction and accomplishment among the architects of AID, there is also an awareness that AID is still in the developmental stage. Problems of finance, organization, and relationships are continuing ones to every organization, and AID is no exception. Thus far, ECA, and its successor MSA, have carried the major portion of AID's budget. It appears now that the American contribution is about to end. Will Germany be prepared to shoulder the entire undertaking? No one, of course, can now answer this question with certainty. Professor Maier-Bode and his co-workers at the federal and state levels tend to be optimistic about the matter. They feel that AID's contribution to Germany's agriculture is so outstanding that the necessary appropriations will be made by the government. The seriousness of the financial problem, however, is reflected in Maier-Bode's words, "The critical point for AID will come in the next 2-3 years; it will be a matter of getting money to continue its work. If this period is passed successfully AID should stand for a hundred years." 49/

Looking back, Maier-Bode and Petrich are content with the decisions and the accomplishments to date. In their opinion, the decision to make AID a "registered association" was sound. It has brought better relationships with the states and given AID an administrative flexibility that it did not possess

---

47/ Ibid.

48/ It is reported that Denmark, Holland, Norway and Turkey have followed the German experience very closely and are making changes in their own agricultural information systems as a result.

49/ Interview with Professor Maier-Bode, October 1952.



as part of the Ministry proper. The question of the internal organization of AID does not disturb them. They feel that, up to this time, AID's subject-matter type of organization has functioned well. They point out that conditions in Germany are different from those in the United States. The newspapers and the radio in Germany have never been used for agricultural information purposes to the extent that they have in the United States. Perhaps, as these media are used to a greater degree, a change in organizational pattern will be beneficial. The opposition from people connected with agricultural publishing houses does not concern AID's leaders too much. In their opinion, AID's policy of contracting with commercial concerns for its printing and film production has reduced greatly the magnitude of this opposition.

Sentiment at the state level is generally favorable to AID although minor complaints are heard here and there. Probably the chief complaint is directed at the operations of AID. Some officials state that the establishment of AID as a "registered association" has not given the states as much control over AID as they had hoped. Some officials take issue with Maier-Bode that the Board of Directors of AID is a governing board. They claim that it is in reality only advisory and that for practical purposes AID is still a part of the Ministry proper.

There is also some feeling at the state level that the relationships between the research institutes and AID are not close enough. The director of AID agrees that this is a legitimate criticism and hopes to strengthen these ties as soon as his personnel situation will permit.

Professor Dr. Heinz Haushofer, in charge of the production branch of the Bayernverband (farmers' organization) of Bavaria, has been a keen and objective observer of the AID program. He takes a broad view in sizing up the situation. He reminds us that historically the political pendulum in Germany swings back and forth from centralization to decentralization. The foundation of AID and its relationships with the states is closely linked with this phenomenon. In his opinion, it was legally and constitutionally impossible for AID to continue as part of the Ministry. It had to be set up as a "registered association." (There are others who disagree with him on this point.) He regards the present arrangement for AID and the two small extension offices in the Ministry proper and their relationships with the states as temporary ones. They represent a stage in the development of a more comprehensive and integrated federal extension service. He feels that AID is reaching the farmer with its publications and films. He believes that it will survive.

Dr. Irmgard Berghaus, of the Federal Research Institute for Home Economics at Bonn, represents the woman's point of view. She feels that AID is performing a great function. It has developed excellent bulletins and films for the farm women. She likes the organization of AID. In her opinion it gives men and women an opportunity to work closely together in the development of bulletins and films - an arrangement they have never had before.

The Americans, too, are pleased with the progress of AID although they are inclined to be somewhat more critical than their German colleagues. As they look back, they do not see too many things that they would do differently if the program could be repeated under similar conditions.

Garnett and Williams, reviewing the over-all extension effort of, first, Military Government and then of the ECA/MSA Mission, reach the same conclusion. In Sam Williams' words, "The biggest mistake the Americans made was in trying to establish an American extension service in Germany without making modifications for German conditions and the German culture. We had to learn that the Germans had to have a chance to take over an idea and implement it in a German fashion. Otherwise, it never became their own." Speaking in even broader terms, Williams went on: "We had to learn that there is one very important difference between American and German agriculture and that all agricultural programs had to start with that fact. The fact is simply this: The cow is the most important single thing in German agriculture. It provides soil fertility; it is a source of draft power on small farms; it is a source of family food in the form of milk and butter; and it is depended upon to give additional farm income through its reproductive capacity. In many ways, the cow is regarded as more important to the farm enterprise than the farmer's wife. Once a person understands this fact then he is in a position to begin to comprehend peasant life. Furthermore, he is then in a position to begin to understand that American ways of doing things and ideas must make allowance for this basic difference."

Hadley Read and Bryant Kearnl, two of the American agricultural information men who have worked closely with AID, have much admiration for the new organization and its work. In their opinion, it is fulfilling a tremendous need in German agriculture. They find many aspects of the situation favorable to AID's continued growth: (1) The publications and movies are technically well produced, (2) the state advisory service wants them, and (3) the farmers and their wives are utilizing them. At the same time they believe that AID has certain weaknesses which require attention. They think that - -

The organization of AID on a subject-matter basis is unsound. 50/

There is inadequate contact with research institutions.

There is a lack of adequate coordination between AID, the state advisory systems, and the research institutions.

There is a certain danger in AID's performing work other than agricultural information, such as technical assistance activities.

50/ Bryant Kearnl, in reflecting on the "organization of AID along subject-matter lines" issue, feels that the Americans never made it clear to the people in AID what was meant by teamwork between subject-matter and editorial workers. Kearnl analyzes the organizational issue in these words: "I think the trouble lies in the German belief that superiority must be clearly indicated. Either an editorial specialist is boss or a subject-matter specialist is boss. If that's the only choice, I go along with the German decision to operate on subject lines. But it has to be made clear that there is still a third choice - one which gives the subject matter specialist the benefit of what other people (information specialists) know about organizing and presenting technical information for general readers, or scientific information for the lay reader". It seems to Kearnl that the Americans failed to get across this third approach to their German counterparts.



There is formidable antagonism from the agricultural publishing houses.

Kearl is also concerned about the process and channels of distribution of AID materials. In his opinion it is essential that county extension workers be made key members of the distribution team. He feels that this has not been done as yet.

Dana Reynolds is not so sure that the organization of AID on a subject-matter basis is unsound. In fact, he feels that up to this point it has been a rather effective way to organize. In looking over the attributes of AID, Reynolds places at the top of the list the highly favorable public-relations influence AID has had on the continent for Germany. Other things that Reynolds particularly admires about AID are (1) the intricate system of developing publications and films, gearing together resources of knowledge at both federal and state levels, (2) the comprehensive distribution system, and (3) the "Assembly of Members" of AID, drawn as it is from agricultural organizations as well as from the government. He would like to see AID give more attention to localized information programs as personnel and time will permit.

How does the American who has worked day in and day out with AID during this developmental period feel about AID? Norman Smith is quite proud of the accomplishments and happy to have had the opportunity to participate so actively in AID's growth. He agrees with Petrich, Read, Kearl, and the others that there are still problems to solve but is certain that they will be solved as other problems have been. Time, patience, and effort are needed to build and maintain an organization. As Smith looks back, he has only two main regrets: The Mission's lack of success in trying to work out a more permanent financial support system for AID, and the fact Garnett's original plan for a federal extension service has not yet been realized. But AID is still young and in the developmental stage and - who knows? - there is still time for Garnett's and Smith's hopes to be fulfilled.



## APPENDIX A

### Explanation of Counterpart Funds\*

Counterpart funds exist only because there is a European Recovery Program (E.R.P.). The counterpart fund is in D-Marks, and arises as a result of imports from the United States. The funds arise as follows:

a. German consumers pay for the commodities they buy that have been imported in raw or processed form.

b. Retailers, wholesalers, and processors who handle these commodities also pay for the commodities in the regular way, but,

c. The importer of the commodities does not pay the United States in dollars. The payment for the commodities exported (from the U. S.) is made out of European Cooperation Administration (E.C.A., and Government and Relief in Occupied Areas, (Garcia) funds. However, the German importer must pay D-Marks for the commodities imported in an amount equivalent to the dollar value of the commodities imported. The accumulation of these D-Mark payments for imported goods constitutes the "Counterpart Fund." This fund is held in trust by the "Bank Deutscher Laender" until it is allocated to counterpart fund projects.

Counterpart funds are used in the economic rehabilitation and reorientation of Western Europe. All counterpart funds released by the U. S. to the Western German Federal Republic are considered public funds within the scope of the German National Investment Program. The money is allocated to specific projects which must have joint approval of E.C.A. and the participating country. The funds are applied in two ways:

a. On a loan basis - credits for agricultural and non-agricultural activities.

b. On a "grant-in-aid" basis. This is to be a special allocation to projects where there is limited or no possibility for repayment, such as funds applied to research, education and advisory work.

---

\*Source: The Food, Agriculture and Forestry Situation and Program, Bavaria and Western Germany. Handbook and Digest. Prepared by Food, Agriculture and Forestry Branch, OLCS, July 1950, P. 30.

## APPENDIX B

### Developments in 1952-53 (October 1952 - October 1953)

Another year has passed and AID continues to make progress. Mr. Smith, in an optimistic report to the author, described the major happenings during 1952-53 and the outlook for the future in these words:

1. "The financing for AID, although not guaranteed (funds for governmental agencies usually are not), seems fairly well assured. Between direct appropriations and funds provided under the DM 95,000,000 scheme, the Federal Government is taking care of the basic budget of AID for fiscal year 1953-54. There seems to be every indication that it will continue to do so.

2. "Discussions with Maier-Bode and Petrich seem to indicate that there is an excellent chance that within the next few years AID will become, in fact, the agricultural extension arm on the federal level. (It may not be called the Federal Extension Service, but there seems to be a good chance that it will function that way and that members of its staff will perform the duties usually connected with federal extension specialists.)

3. "The relationships between AID and other agencies, including the press and radio and Extension Service, seem to be constantly improving. At the present time (October 1953) AID is sponsoring a series of state-level meetings on agricultural information and visual aids methods for agricultural extension workers. In some cases, two or three such meetings are being held in each state in order to insure attendance by the majority of the extension editors. From all reports, these meetings are being enthusiastically received, and I feel that this is the start of what will prove to be a continuous working relationship along this line between the state-level agricultural extension editors and AID.

4. "Two years ago, in 1951, a great many people on the state level and in various agricultural organizations had never heard of AID or its work. One year ago there were still some people in this category. At the present time, however, AID is known throughout the Federal Republic, and it would not be easy to find individuals working in the professional agricultural field who have not heard of it, or do not have access to its services.

5. "The audience for agricultural films shown by AID's mobile units has surpassed 300,000 and may by now have surpassed 400,000. This does not include a count of the individuals who have seen the films distributed directly from its film library.

6. "AID has established the agricultural exhibits for the Federal Ministry and is represented in every major agricultural show in the Federal Government.

7. "With the twelve-week information short course conducted by Professor Kearn at AID last year, the first physical move toward establishment of agricultural information offices in the various colleges and universities got under way. Selected individuals from among those who attended the short course were sent to the United States under a technical assistance project. Several of these are now employed by the colleges and universities as agricultural information specialists. They are presently paid under a project that we (MSA) established which provides for 20,000 DM for each college and university to pay the salary of an information man and a secretary, and to cover the cost of essential equipment and office operations for a period of one year. Starting April 1, 1954, it is expected that the colleges and universities will assume the cost in this connection. At the time of accepting the DM 20,000, they agreed to do everything possible to finance the effort in the future. The fact that the first course, which was initiated at the University of Bonn in March 1953, was attended by over 100 students (which is about one-third of the student body) is an indication of the popularity of this type of education. In addition to teaching regular courses for students (which are designed not to produce agricultural journalists, but rather to provide a background in information methods and techniques), information workers at the colleges and universities will be holding short in-service training courses for agricultural extension service personnel, and will serve as extension editors. This work is the first of its kind in Europe, and in my mind, is a distinct milestone in the development of information work in European countries. AID is assuming its responsibilities of keeping in contact with these various individuals and the results promise to be a strengthening in the ties between the information and extension services and the colleges.

8. "In 1953, AID conducted a nation-wide greenland improvement campaign designed to contact every farmer in the Federal Republic in the land size group of 5 to 50 hectares, and to influence them to adopt one or more greenland improvement practices. This is probably the first full-scale nation-wide campaign conducted in a specific (agricultural) field in Europe, particularly since the war."





